

Why We Will Fight #10

25 May 1998

By Mike Vanderboegh, 1ACR

Why We Will Fight, #10
A John Doe Times Publication
25 May 1998

In this Issue:

"Twilight of the gods"-- Elucidations & Amplifications

AND:

"Rodney King" Wants To Roast Marshmallows at the "Gotterdammerung Bar-be- que":

"Can't We All Just Get Along?"

AND:

An Unhappy Camper Wants Off the Mailing List

"The Law perverted! And the police powers of the state perverted along with it! The law, I say, not only turned from its proper purpose but made to follow an entirely contrary purpose! The law becomes the weapon of every king of greed! Instead of checking crime, the law itself guilty of the evils it is supposed to punish! If this is true, it is a serious fact, and MORAL duty requires me to call the attention of my fellow citizens to it." (emphasis supplied)

-- Frederic Bastiat, The Law.

"Cure the evils of Democracy by the evils of Fascism! Funny therapeutics! I've heard of their curing syphilis by giving the patient malaria, but I've never heard of their curing malaria by giving the patient syphilis."

-- Sinclair Lewis, It Can't Happen Here.

From the Editor:

Whoa, mule! Why We Will Fight, #9, "Twilight of the gods" (Parts One and Two) sure got some folks riled up. Some because of what I said, some because of what I didn't say (or didn't say clearly or completely enough).

I got some very nasty (some of it incoherent and wildly ungrammatical) email regarding my "apostasy" from the "patriot" cause that I would dare criticize two upstanding American "heroes" as Louis Beam and Martin Lindstedt. As most of this was profane or worse, I'll not repeat it here. Had a couple of "cancel my subscriptions". One of these, "Unhappy Camper", appears as an addendum to this email. There were a couple of "how-could-you-dare-attack- such-a-wonderful-human-being-as-Martin-Lindstedt" with one of them insisting that Martin had never, in her lifetime, ever told a lie. I was reminded of a quote from one of Martin's "heroes":

"National Socialism does not harbor the slightest aggressive intent towards any European nation."

-- Adolf Hitler, NSDAP party congress, 1935.

Yup, that Adolf sure was a straight shooter, just like Martin I'll bet.

Now several folks got the idea that because I was speaking from a Christian perspective, that I somehow believed in constitutional rights only for Christians. As more than one of these are people that I respect immensely (such as Bill Utterback and Jon Roland, whose critiques are reprinted below), I realized that I must not have made my position clear. Perhaps I assumed that since I had enunciated my position on this clearly in earlier Why We Will Fights, that I did not need to spell it out in #9. A mistake, certainly, on my part.

Let me be as plain as I was in earlier issues:

1. The Constitution's protections extend to all regardless of race, creed, color, religion (or lack thereof), national origin, etc. To this I have sworn an oath before God.

2. Yes, I believe that extends to my enemies, personal and political, including Nazis, even including Bill Clinton and his puppeteers.

3. I would of course extend the rules of war to enemies who fell under my authority. American soldiers, including militiamen, learn, teach and respect the Laws of War. It is Nazis who engage in Malmedy massacres, Lidices, Ouradours, Dachaus, Trebilinkas, Auschwitz's and others too numerous to mention. Were Lindstedt and his Nazi-running-dogs to show up in my neighborhood, they would be given: a.) the first shot; b.) the chance to surrender after their assault had been torn apart by the neighborhood watch's crossfire; c.) and, after we apply the flex-cuffs, trips to the Sheriff's office, hospital or the morgue as appropriate. We would even say a prayer for their departed, heathen souls.

4. The 1st Alabama Cavalry Regiment, Constitutional Militia is probably the most broad-based outfit you will find. We have no atheists that I know of, but we've got some hardshelled skeptics, every manner of Christian (even some that other Christians don't consider Christian, and vice versa), Jewish folks, one devout Moslem (not "muslim" as in Farrakhan), Republicans, Democrats, libertarians, some Irishmen and a couple of dogs (faith not listed). They span every socio-economic class. Heck we even got some token racists of the unaffiliated type. So what? The main thing is, as I said in an earlier WWWF, that American is a country where you can hate anyone you like, as long as you don't commit crimes or seek to make your particular brand of hate the law of the land. As we said, the Constitution is for anybody and everybody. Nazis, as Lindstedt makes plain, seek to destroy the Constitution and supplant it with their Nazi "aristocracy".

"We do not believe in programs, in plans, in saints or apostles, above all we do not believe in happiness, in salvation, in the promised land."

-- Benito Mussolini, "Fascism."

5. Our enemies, that is, collectivists like Lindstedt and Clinton who would destroy or pervert the Constitution are self-selecting-- they have determined on their own to attack the thing we have sworn to preserve, protect and defend against all enemies foreign and domestic. Now having chosen this course they have also chosen to lie about their ultimate intentions, although I will give Lindstedt points for his latest writings (such as "Gottterdammerung", and unlike his earlier stuff) are refreshingly pointed about the Nazi direction of his opinions. Clinton is still obfuscating. But it needs no great detective to see that they are flip sides of the same collectivist coin. C'mon guys, we got in this to oppose "jack- bootied thugs". Does it matter that Lindstedt's band of thugs at this point in time merely aspire to the power the ATF has, rather than to roll it back in the interest of the safety of all citizens as do we? Their intentions are clearly the same, or worse, as the Clintonistas and should they ever get power they'll make the BATF look like kindergarteners. Why should we believe anything they have to say, merely because they currently lack the power to enforce their will upon us? Does this powerlessness make them our friends?

6. The basis of MY opposition to both the Nazis and the Clintonistas is faith- based. In this I am hardly alone. Reference this from Bastiat:

"Life is a gift from God. We hold from God the gift which includes all others. This gift is life-- physical, intellectual, and moral life. But life cannot sustain itself alone. The Creator of life has entrusted us with the responsibility of preserving, developing and perfecting it. In order that we may accomplish this, He has provided us with a collection of marvelous faculties. And He has put us in the midst of a variety of natural resources. By the application of our faculties to these natural resources we convert them into products, and use them. This process is necessary in order that life may run its appointed course. Life, faculties, production-- in other words, individuality, liberty, property-- this is man. And in spite of artful political leaders, these three gifts from God precede all human legislation, and are superior to it. Life, Liberty and property do not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it was the fact that life, liberty and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place.

What, then, is law? It is the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense. Each of us has a natural right--from God-- to defend his person, his liberty, and his property. These are the three basic requirements of life, and the preservation of any one of them is completely dependent upon the preservation of the other two. For what are our faculties but the extension of our individuality? And what is property but an extension of our faculties? If every person has the right to defend-- even by force-- his person, his liberty, and his property, then it follows that a group of men have the right to organize and support a common force to protect these rights constantly. Thus the principle of collective right-- its reason for existing, its lawfulness-- is based on individual right. And the common force that protects this collective right can not logically have any other purpose or any other mission than that for which its acts as a substitute. Thus since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty or property of another individual, then the common force--for the same reason-- cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups.

Such a perversion of force would be, in both cases, contrary to our premise. Force has been given to us to defend our own individual rights. Who will dare to say that force has been given to us to destroy the equal rights of our brothers? Since no individual acting separately can lawfully use force to destroy the rights of others, does it not logically follow that the same principle also applies to the common force that is nothing more than the organized combination of the individual forces? If this is true, then nothing can be more evident than this: The law is the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. It is the substitute of a common force for individual forces. And this common force is to do only what the individual forces have a natural and lawful right to do: to protect persons, liberties, and properties; to maintain the right of each, and to cause justice to reign over us all."

-- Frederic Bastiat, The Law.

And this from M.E. Bradford:

"After reviewing the composite identity of the framers as religious men of a certain disposition, after remembering who and what they were and the consonance of their collective character with what they did about religion and government, we are ready once more to confront the questions with which this study began. What is sometimes lost in our reading of the First Amendment is that serious Christians can travel only so far toward that perfect toleration which prevents a public profession of faith in each and every circumstance, or which leaves God out of the performance of public duty, ignores His interest in and authority over our civil existence. To be absolutely tolerant is to be indifferent and less than fully Christian. There must be a point of tangency, as Saint Augustine maintained, between the City of Man and that more lasting habitation after which part of our nature yearns, wherever we reside and however we disguise our inclination. Therefore the ostensible neutrality of the framers, the federal tolerance and horror of sectarianism that they

made into a part of the Constitution, could not be allowed to become the kind of restriction on local religious self-expression that the idea of a wall of separation would require....

Once we have considered the first 150 years of our nation's legal history, we can recognize in its handling of religion a reflection, an extension, of the composite or summary Framers whom I earlier described as a conventional Christian and social conservative. In the successful effort made by that paternal figure to protect an arrangement already in place in 1789, adding to it the prospect of a nonsectarian national religious expression, we see fulfillment of the promise summarized in Washington's 'Proclamation: A National Thanksgiving' of October 3, 1789; an acknowledgement that God deals with nations as well as men; that nations may pray, supplicate and give thanks, be pardoned, enjoy protection and favor, or endure deserved condemnation; a recognition that God may interpose, that He is the author of all good 'that was, that is, or that shall be.' President Washington asks for his country peace, civil and religious liberty, the means of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge-- and as much prosperity 'as He alone knows to be best.' He marks himself with all of this language as a Christian magistrate, enforcing legitimate laws that have divine sanction, even though they may only approximate pure justice. That he often employs periphrasis in speaking of the Deity signifies only a desire to avoid the appearance of sectarian assertion.

A nation that thus expressed itself might also invoke God as arbiter of great disputes, and judge our individual behavior as social creatures in the City of Man. Such a country might proclaim His goodness as the measure of all that they admired and praise His name-- while still refusing to commit itself to any sectarian peculiarities. But it could not confuse freedom of religion with freedom from religion.....In 1789 they had made precisely the amendment they wanted and then interpreted that intention, embodied in that amendment, by what they attempted under its auspices-- what they believed it allowed. We could not expect them as Christian statesmen to design a country that would, by reason of a "wall of separation", become an absolutely secular state: a country that, because of the provisions of the law, would not allow the federal legislature to express its purposes in terms of non-sectarian piety. They could anticipate that without fierce opposition some people might very well expend themselves in seeking greater and greater perfections of toleration-- perfections that would, in the end, bring antireligious regimentation. As Christians, they (and their neighbors) recognized that something better (and more representative) than absolute toleration was necessary.

In conclusion, we may reason from the overwhelming biographical evidence and from the important texts which attach to it as personal or collective proof that, from what we know of the Framers (and of the three generations of Americans who followed after them) it is a farfetched conjecture to say that, through a series of gestures toward an ever more thoroughgoing neutrality, they set out to secularize America. To argue thus concerning the heritage that, of a purpose, they left to their children and grandchildren is to attribute to them what is not in human nature-- indeed, what is contrary to that given about which we announce our opinions when we do not believe a character in a play or doubt a newspaper report of implausible activity. For, in so far as they held to a Christian faith, they would not wish to live in a society that in no way identifies itself as a Christian community, which in its impious political character would invite the wrath of God. Neither did they wish to put their descendants in a situation where they cannot profess their Christianity in and through their work."

-- M.E. Bradford, Original Intentions.

Conclusion:

So, while my militia unit is not "Christian" per se, but "Constitutional" made up mostly of men and women who happen to be Christians, the basis of my opposition to collectivists of any stripe, including Clinton, Stalin, Hitler, Beam and Lindstedt, is both political AND religious.

This does not mean 1ACR is about to launch a "jihad" on the heathen Nazi (or Clintonistas). Although I meant what I said about "no more freebies after OKC." If the Feds won't move in on these criminals well known to them, the militia and state authorities may have to figure a way to do so. Even so, this does not mean we would not come to the defense of Nazis who were being attacked by the Clintonista Administration for their opinions alone (absent any law-breaking). Although, I will say that given what we know about neoNazis as terrorist catspaws for the administration we would be quite cautious about such a situation. I think the phrase from "The X-Files" fits here: "Trust No One."

Of course in peacetime, like every other Constitutional militia unit in Alabama, we can only be called into official service by the Governor, or by the Sheriff of our respective counties for service within the county. We are not a private army. Yet there are a myriad of ways the militia can act unofficially and legally as armed citizens (or sometimes as unarmed citizens) to prevent a potential tragedy or expose official wrongdoing. The Good O' Boys Roundup comes to mind. Officially or unofficially, by definition we are willing to defend all the people, regardless of faith, or lack of it. Few of us would have agreed with David Koresh's religious opinions, but had we been ready we might have accomplished something at Waco that could have prevented tragedy: airborne insertion of a militia-escorted TV crew with tape and satellite feed, for example. Unfortunately, most of us were sleepwalking before Waco. Now we're awake.

But one thing that the Constitutional militia movement is not awake to is the continuing efforts of Nazis like Lindstedt and Beam to parasitically attach themselves as "patriots" to our movement, seeking legitimacy, converts and protection. Take Waco, for example. Lindstedt refers to Koresh and Waco in his "Gotterdammerung". This is mere insincere Hitlerian lipservice. There isn't a Nazi alive who gives a rat's rear end about the torching and burning of a racially integrated, religious community. They view that as the just deserts of "race traitors" and "effeminate Christians." But because they know the name resonates with others not-so-Nazi, they put it in a stream-of-consciousness rhetoric that is as insincere as a Clinton campaign promise.

One of the critical emails I received was a Rodney King-like plea which paraphrased was: "Can't we all just get along?" "Don't we have enough enemies, without making more and being divided?" he asked. And my answer to that is "No!"-- We can't just all get along. No one will be sitting around the Gotterdammerung roasting marshmallows, singing songs of peace and harmony. Nothing has changed since George S. Patton told his troops, "The Nazis are the enemy!" We can't make them our enemy, they already are-- have been for generations. The fact that this crop was raised in the U.S.A. makes its fruit no less poisonous. They are, as the Bard wrote in King Lear:

"And from the extremest upward of thy head To the descent and dust below thy foot, A most toad-spotted traitor."

Finally, there is this. I have come to my present faith through the Constitutional militia movement and the events I have been witness to the past 5 years. I was a lukewarm Christian for many years. But there are few, if any, atheists in foxholes. And while we are not yet in a shooting war with either the Clinton administration or their terrorist toadies the Nazis, I have come to my present beliefs through my experiences in the Cold War with the collectivists. My beliefs have sustained me, protected me, and guided me. I do not require my friends to believe as I do. But the simple fact that I have developed a closer relationship with the Lord and that as a Christian, I cannot fear my own earthly death, has made me, I think, a better man, a better husband and father, a better citizen, a better militiaman. It is all in God's hands, and that makes the struggle easier. I know where I am going, regardless of the outcome, and I have no fear, only joy. And the ironic thing is, that's the one thing Clintonista would-be tyrants and Nazi pack-dogs share-- a twin-fear of the free man who looks them in the eye unafraid, and judgement in the next world for their crimes in the here and now.

"And they shall fight against thee; but they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee."

-- Jeremiah, Chapter 1, Verse 19.

If my intentions have been misunderstood by my friends, I apologize. I try to be careful of what I write. Particularly when talking about Why We Will Fight.

Glory be to God and God save the Republic!

-- Mike Vanderboegh, 1ACR

Editor, Why We Will Fight & The John Doe Times

"Trust in the Lord, Walk in the Light, Speak the Truth, Carry a .45, and Count on Competent Fire Support."

In a message dated 98-05-24 15:52:04 EDT, you write:

Subj: Why We Will Fight,#9:Twilight of the gods:Lindstedt's Nazi Virus Examined

Date: 98-05-24 15:52:04 EDT

From: jon.roland@constitution.org (Jon Roland)

To: misc-activism-militia@moderators.uu.net

I would add to Bill's comment that it is our duty even to defend the usurpers' and oppressors' rights. The fact that we might find ourselves momentarily on opposite sides in a tactical situation does not change the fundamental principle.

The test of our devotion to the principles of constitutional government is our willingness to protect the rights of those we disagree with and who have been opposed to us. -

-Jon

From: Bill Utterback

Subject: Re: Why We Will Fight,#9:Twilight of the gods:Lindstedt's Nazi Virus Examined

Date: Sun, 24 May 1998 14:29:17 -0500

To: Mo10Cav

At 04:26 AM 5/24/98 EDT, you wrote:

In a message dated 98-05-24 01:16:50 EDT, you write:

What functional or moral difference is there between white supremacists/racists/nazis who care only for their own tribe and Christians who have a duty to protect only themselves and other righteous believers?

Be careful what you write.

for Liberty (for all),
Bill Utterback

Mike Vanderboegh responds:

Okay, now I see your text. It's 3:30 in the morning & I'm a bit groggy. Anyway, to answer your question with a question: Who would you rather be taken prisoner by: a Christian, a devout Jew, or a Nazi? Christians (&)Constitutionalists don't go around attacking innocents, its a violation of

two dearly held beliefs-- one religious the other political. For Nazis et al it's a violation of nothing-- its what they do.
-- Mike

Bill Utterback responds:

Mike:

It's not a matter of who you attack to which I'm referring, but rather who you defend (or don't defend). You sign yourself "1ACR" and are recognized nationally as a spokesman for the militia and the patriot movement. The militia (the people) is defensive in nature. Speaking of who you are willing to defend is an important statement.

Incidentally, my personal spirituality does not bear a label. I do my best to follow the teachings of Jesus. I do not adhere to any form of churchianity. Many so-called Christians seem to think that only those who bear the banner of Christian churchianity possess a moral foundation or have access to God. They would do well to review what Jesus said were the first and second most important commandments and to note that the second commandment says "neighbor", NOT "Christian neighbor" (Matthew 22:39, Mark 12:31, and Luke 10:27). The parable of the good Samaritan comes to mind.

I spent a year going around to different counties in Texas, helping the local people to form militia units. Although not all information about the militia should be public, I stressed the necessity to post public notice of general meetings and election of leaders. The units of the Texas Constitutional Militia were publicly formed under the authority of the people of each county and were unquestionably lawful under both the Texas and federal constitutions. I also worked with the leaders from other areas to form the regional organization and called the first statewide muster of militia in Texas since 1836, where 500+ militia participants met for a day at the Alamo in downtown San Antonio.

Many times during this process I announced, "The Texas Constitutional Militia is NOT a Christian militia - nor is it a Jewish, or Muslim, or Buddhist, or white, or male, or any kind of militia other than a TEXAS militia". My concept was that the TCM existed to defend the Texas Constitution, the federal Constitution, and the people of Texas. Note that I did not say the Christian people of Texas, but rather the people of Texas. An armed defensive group that is formed to defend only blacks, or only Christians, or only any other group is not a militia but rather a private army. The militia is the people, which is to say the whole people. The militia properly defends the whole people - it does not stop to ask "What religion do you claim?"

Many times patriots are confused about what is required to act under the authority of the people. They think, "I and my five friends are people, therefore we can do whatever we want under the authority of we, the people." Wrong. That was the mistake made by the Republic of Texas group which tried to form lawful government(s) under the authority of the people. They were not acting under the authority of the people, but rather under the falsely presumed authority of their own small group. It is the right of a militia unit to exclude disruptive persons after they have shown themselves to be disruptive. However, when a militia unit excludes persons because of their skin color, their religion, or other such factors it is not a militia unit but rather a private army. Militias act under the authority of the people and they include the whole people, or at least as many of the whole people as choose to become active participants. Militias who restrict those who they would defend to one class of people are not acting under the authority of the whole people and are not lawful militias. By the way, there is no such thing as a "member" of a militia. The militia is the whole people, some of whom choose to become active participants.

When you write "the fact that those of us who are Christians have a duty to protect ourselves and other righteous believers from those who would destroy us", it appears that you are failing to acknowledge that it is the duty of the militia to protect the people and to preserve a government with Liberty and justice for ALL. Actually, it gives the appearance that you are saying that it is the duty of the militia to protect only "righteous believers", or Christians who meet your criteria for eligibility. Once you establish the precedent that unrighteous people are not worthy of protection by the militia, it is all too easy for someone else to determine that YOU are unrighteous and unworthy of defense. The militia of the several states is composed of the people of the several states, NOT only the Christian people of the several states. The duty of the militia is to defend the people of the several states, NOT only the Christian people of the several states. You appear to be allowing your religion to spill over into the militia and you seem to be forgetting that the militia is the whole people and the militia defends the whole people - NOT just the people who are righteous by somebody's definition.

Please give this subject some serious consideration.

And be careful what you write.

for Liberty (for all),
Bill

Feel free to post this if you desire.

-----End of Original Message-----

```
=====
Constitution Society, 1731 Howe Av #370, Sacramento, CA 95825
916/568-1022, 916/450-7941VM Date: 05/24/98 Time: 12:46:07
http://www.constitution.org/ mailto:jon.roland@constitution.org
===== >>
```

RE: Unhappy Camper

In a message dated 98-05-25 18:49:31 EDT, you write:

Subj: Re: unsubscribe
Date: 98-05-25 18:49:31 EDT
From: bequip@verdenet.com (John Lee)
To: Mo10Cav@aol.com (Mo10Cav)

No, not forwarded. receive directly from Mo10Cav You seem to be sending me something I have no desire to contend with. Christianity is a bastard offshoot of judaism and I want no part of either fallacy.

John Lee

Dear Unhappy Camper,

Sorry you're about to have such an unpleasant Eternity. But I must tell you that having checked my email list again, you are not on it. Were you ever a subscriber to The John Doe Times? Are you listed under your real name, John Lee? Are you sure you're not getting it from PIML? On the other hand, maybe God's trying to tell you something.

-- Mike Vanderboegh, 1ACR
John 3:16.



[Why We Will Fight](#) Index



[Email](#) to Author



[The XLData Net Home Page](#)

Clark Simmons, WebMaster

USA



[Email](#) to Webmaster

Copyright © , 1998, The John Doe Times
Created -- 5/25/98
Revised --